

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 13, 15-21 and 23 are now pending in the application. Claims 2, 10-12, 14 and 22 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carneal et al. (WO 99/08429, hereinafter Carneal) in view of Gupta (U.S. Pat. No. 6,212,565, hereinafter Gupta). Claims 1-23 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang et al. ("An In-depth Survey on Web Caching," hereinafter Zhang) in view of Dillon et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,658,463, hereinafter Dillon). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note independent claim 1 has been amended to include "a user communication device (UCD) located on said mobile platform and connected to said child proxy server," and that independent claims 13 and 20 have also been amended similarly to include this limitation. Independent claim 7 also currently recites this limitation, and has been further amended to include "wherein said web cache service stores web pages and said child proxy server accesses said web pages in said web cache service if said UCD requests access to said web pages." Applicants respectfully assert that neither Carneal, Gupta, Zhang nor Dillon, alone or in combination, teach or suggest Applicants' invention as claimed.

Carneal does not disclose whatsoever the use of a UCD on a mobile platform, and further does not mention a mobile platform whatsoever. Rather, Carneal teaches away from using a UCD on a mobile platform as the invention of Carneal is directed towards improving network communications between multiple land based computers which would normally be connected together through telephone lines. (p. 6). Likewise, Gupta does not teach or suggest the use of a UCD on a mobile platform, rather Gupta appears to teach improved routing for web based content to a plurality of land based computer systems. (See generally Col. 3). Zheng appears to teach merely the use of satellite systems to transmit United Kingdom web content to the United States. Zheng is completely silent to the use of a UCD on mobile platform. Similarly, Dillon fails to teach or suggest the use of a UCD on a mobile platform whatsoever, rather Dillon appears to teach only the use of satellite servers for land based networks which interface with a inbound channel such as a “dial-up connection to the internet.” (Col. 4, lines 22-42). Further, Applicants note Carneal, Gupta, Zheng and Dillon are all silent as to the use of a UCD on a mobile platform to access web pages.

Accordingly, as Carneal, Gupta, Zheng and Dillon all fail to teach or suggest the use of a UCD on a mobile platform, Applicants respectfully assert independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 20 are patentable and in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 30, 2004

By: 
Mark D. Elchuk, Reg. No. 33,686

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MDE/EKS/ps